



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,286	06/22/2001	Ronald A. Katz	6646-101D7	9210

7590 02/18/2004

Attention: Reena Kuyper
A2D, L.P.
Suite 315
9220 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90069

EXAMINER

CARTER, MONICA SMITH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3722

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/888,286

Applicant(s)

KATZ, RONALD A.

Examiner

Monica S. Carter

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 24-26, 28-33, 35, 36, 38-41, 43 and 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr et al. ('530) in view of Roberts et al. ('553).

Barr et al. disclose the claimed invention including a product (10- ticket) for use with a telephone-interface system accessed through a telephone communication facility; the ticket being a base substrate having telephone number data indicative of a toll free number ("800-999-1000", "800-886-5000", "800-123-9000" - see figs. 1a, 1b, 2 and 3) which is to be entered by a caller via a telephone; the indicia (20) being unique identification data ("The number in the game area 20 may be different from the other number in other cards", see col. 2, lines 60-62; therefore, game area provides unique identification data); the substrate having additional data (30) printed thereon; obscuring means (22, 32) for obscuring the indicia; the obscuring means being provided over at least a portion of the unique identification data (as seen in figure 1); and the substrate further including another unconcealed indicia ("INSTRUCTIONS", as seen in figures 1, 1a, 1b, 2 and 3).

Barr et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the indicia including a visual symbolic graphic representation and the additional data including a machine-readable code.

Roberts et al. disclose lottery tickets having visual symbolic graphic representation (14) that is also represented in machine-readable format (16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Barr's invention to include graphic and machine readable indicia, as taught by Roberts et al., to provide indicia that is both aesthetically pleasing to the eye and provides tamper-proof capabilities for ensuring proper use of the lottery tickets.

As to the indicia on the substrate serving as a consumable key (claims 24 and 29) or telephone number data relating to called terminal digital data (claims 30 and 31) or the unique identification data being tested by a telephonic-interface control system to provide an indication of that limits (one time only use – claims 38 and 46; up to an extent of a limited dollar value – claims 40 and 48; during a defined interval of time – claims 45 and 47) specified on the use of the products that have been satisfied before allowing the callers to gain access to the at least certain operations of the specific telephone processing format (claims 32 and 41), the Examiner finds no new and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate upon which it is placed. That is, the relationship of the printed matter and the substrate merely set forth one of support and display. Accordingly, the content of the printed matter called for does not patentably distinguish over the prior art in terms of patentability. See *In re*

Art Unit: 3722

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401 (Fed. Cir. 1983) and *In re Miller*, 418 F. 2d 1392, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969).

Regarding claims 32, 33, 35, 36 and 38-40, see the above rejections. Further, Barr et al., as modified by Roberts et al., disclose providing a plurality of products for use with a telephone-interface system accessed through a telephone communication facility (see col. 1, lines 14-17 – "...a game comprising one or more tickets...").

3. Claims 27, 34, 37, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr et al. in view of Roberts et al. and further in view of Goldman et al. ('708).

Barr et al., as modified by Roberts et al., disclose the claimed invention except for the substrate having a value assigned to the product.

Goldman et al. disclose lottery tickets having a value assigned (12 - \$1) to the ticket. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Barr's invention to include a value assigned thereto, as taught by Goldman et al., to visually provide the customer with an indication of price for the lottery tickets such that the customer would not have to rely on the seller to provide pricing information.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Barr fails to disclose a "specific telephone processing format" or any selectivity for accessing such a "format" or "certain operations of said specific telephone processing format." In response to applicant's arguments, the above recitations have not been given patentable weight because the recitations occur in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hira*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In the instant case, the preamble merely recites the purpose of the intended use of the product of the card, wherein the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness.

Applicant argues that the ultimate objective of Barr is to conceal telephone numbers, which is contrary to applicant's system. The examiner maintains that even though the card of Barr may have a different objective, the card continues to disclose the limitations in the claimed invention as set forth in the above rejections.

Applicant argues that Barr fails to disclose "unique identification data". The examiner maintains that the indicia 20 may be different from other numbers in other cards, therefore, providing "unique identification data" (see col. 2, lines 60-62). Presuming, arguendo, that applicant does not consider the indicia 20 of Barr to be "unique", it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include "unique identification data", since it would only

Art Unit: 3722

depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed on the card. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the card may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of card does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the card for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the card which is required for patentability.

Applicant argues that Barr fails to disclose the card having "another unconcealed indicia" (claim 24). The examiner disagrees and maintains that the substrate of Barr discloses unconcealed indicia ("INSTRUCTIONS") as seen in figures 1, 1a, 1b, 2 and 3.

Applicant argues that Barr fails to disclose carrying unique identification data that enables "access to certain operations of the specific telephone processing format" nor does it serve as a "consumable key". In response to applicant's argument, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA

Art Unit: 3722

1963). In this case, the card substrate of Barr is capable of performing the intended use of enabling "access to certain operations of the specific telephone processing format" and serve as a "consumable key" depending on the printed matter included on the card substrate. As stated above, the content of the printed matter called for is not functionally related to the substrate and, therefore, does not patentably distinguish over the prior art in terms of patentability.

Applicant argues that Roberts is void of any suggestion of "telephone number data" printed on a card or ticket and accordingly is void of such a number having the capability to access a "specific telephone processing format." It is noted that Roberts is solely used for disclosing lottery tickets having indicia including a visual symbolic graphic representation and additional data including a machine-readable code and has not been relied upon for disclosing any of the other claimed limitations.

Applicant's remarks considers Roberts alone; however, the rejections in the previous Office action are based on the Barr reference in view of Roberts. Roberts, alone, has not been used as a basis for rejection. As state above, Roberts is solely used for disclosing lottery tickets having indicia including a visual symbolic graphic representation and additional data including a machine-readable code and has not been relied upon for disclosing any of the other claimed limitations. The examiner maintains that Barr, as modified by Roberts, does disclose the claimed invention as set forth in the above rejections.

Applicant argues the use of *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983) with respect to the presently claimed invention. Applicant states that the Gulack case did not

Art Unit: 3722

involve data to be processed by a machine. Rather, it involved a substrate whose indicia were useful only to the human mind. The applicant further argues that in the present case, the data are for processing by a telephone-interface control system so the relationship of the data to the control system must be considered. The examiner maintains that presently claimed invention sets forth a card product having indicia. The purpose of intent of the card does not set forth any structural limitations with respect to the card itself. The card merely supports printed matter where the printed matter does not convey any meaningful relationship in regard to the substrate and does not require any particular substrate to effectively convey the information. Thus, there is no meaningful functional relationship between the indicia and the substrate.

The examiner asserts that the card of Barr, as modified by Roberts, comprising telephone number data, unique identification data, an obscuring means for at least a portion of the unique identification data and other unconcealed data is the same structure claimed by applicant.

Applicant argues that Goldman et al. fails to disclose the claimed invention for the same reasons as set forth above. It is noted that Goldman is used solely for disclosing lottery tickets having a value assigned to them and has not been relied upon for disclosing any of the other claimed limitations.

For the reasons as set forth above, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica S. Carter whose telephone number is (703) 305-0305. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea L. Wellington can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 17, 2004

Monica S. Carter
MONICA S. CARTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER